

**From:**Andrew Limmer  
**Sent:**31 May 2021 15:48:21 +0100  
**To:**Planning & Regulatory Services  
**Subject:**Objection to Planning Application 21/00706/FUL

**CAUTION:** External Email

Dear Sir

**Application Number:** 21/00706/FUL  
**Proposed Development:** Erection of dwellinghouse  
**Location:** Land South of Stable Cottage (Plot 4), Westcote Farm, Hawick

I am writing to object to the above planning application on the following grounds.

1. I am very concerned that this plot is intended to be operated as a holiday let. The applicant is already operating the whole of Plot 2 (planning ref 15/01380/FUL) as a holiday let along with the partial letting of Plot 3 (planning ref 17/00857/FUL). In addition, the glamping site operating at Westcote Farm has rapidly turned the settlement at Westcote into a tourism destination as opposed to a rural residential setting: [www.westcoteglamping.co.uk](http://www.westcoteglamping.co.uk)
2. A previous planning application (ref 16/01124/PPP) to develop Plot 4 was withdrawn by the applicant in 2016. In an email from Andrew Evans (SBC Planning Officer) to the applicant's agent dated 21 Oct 2016 Mr Evans stated: *It is not however possible for plot 4 to be supported. This is considered not to be well related to the existing building group.* I do not believe that this application is materially different from application 16/01124/PPP and I am not aware that the council's planning policy has changed during this period.
3. Furthermore, the response from Paul Grigor (SBC Roads Planning Service) in respect of the 2016 application for Plot 4 stated: *The maximum number of new builds which can be served by a private access is four, which excludes conversions, after which the access requires to be upgraded to an adoptable standard. This proposal would be numbers 3 and 4 in terms of new build, therefore will still be below the threshold for a public road.* I would like to point out that there are 4 new build properties already consented at Westcote:
  - 08/01278/REM (Erection of dwellinghouse)
  - 10/00988/PPP and 12/01395/AMC (Plot 1)
  - 15/01380/FUL (Plot 2)
  - 17/00857/FUL (Plot 3)
4. The settlement at Westcote is served by a private track accessed via a junction from the A698. I am concerned that the cumulative additional vehicular movements are

causing accelerated erosion and degradation of the running surface of the track, with insufficient passing places to accommodate this extra traffic. Furthermore, condition no.8 of planning ref 17/00857/FUL for Plot 3 required various upgrade works be completed to the track and also the junction with the A698 prior to Plot 3 being occupied. These upgrade works are yet to be completed despite Plot 3 being occupied for in excess of 6 months. In addition, the no.3 visitor parking spaces adjacent to Plot 2 (planning ref 15/01380/FUL) severely encroach onto the access track, making it difficult to pass when the visitor spaces are occupied. In summary, I am very concerned that the access track cannot cope with the addition of a further building plot at Westcote.

If you would like to discuss any of the above matters in more detail please do not hesitate to contact us by phone or email.

Kind regards

Mr Andrew Limmer and Mrs Leonore Limmer

Owners, The Auld Byre, Westcote Farm, Hawick, TD9 8SX

# Comments for Planning Application 21/00706/FUL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00706/FUL

Address: Land South Of Stable Cottage (Plot 4) Westcote Farm Hawick Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Brett Taylor

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Aileen Wilson

Address: Westcote Farmhouse, Westcote, Hawick, Scottish Borders TD9 8SX

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Objection re 21/00706/FUL; Erection of Dwelling house, Land South of Stable Cottage (Plot 4), Westcote Farm, Hawick, Scottish Borders.

We are emailing in reference to Planning Application 21/00706/FUL. We wish to lodge our objection to the application as follows:

1. Siting: the siting of the proposed property will encroach on a previously undisturbed green field site and sit outwith the existing grouping of houses within the steading. The proposed house would not relate to, nor fit within, the existing building group. The visual impact of the proposed dwelling house will give a negative impact to the surrounding area and the existing grouping. While the planning application reference states 'land South of Stable Cottage', in our opinion this does not locate the proposed property within the existing grouping. Indeed, study of this and a previous plan (Ref: 16/01124/PPP) which was withdrawn in 2016 show that there is little, if indeed no change, to the plan submitted then. This proposal was refused as "Plot 4 is not considered to be well related to the existing building group". We can find no evidence that Scottish Borders Council planning policy has changed since then.

2. Access: before accessing the proposed property via the new 'road', access will be via an existing track which will not be fit for purpose; the turn off from the main road (A698) still requires upgrading to a suitable standard, the track itself does not have adequate water run off as is required and deep channels and potholes regularly appear. There is no formalised maintenance of the track with repairs being done in an adhoc way with no planned, regular intervention.

The potential of at least 4/5 additional vehicles is a concern. Currently 12 residential vehicles must contend with an increasingly inadequate track, not to mention the many, regular delivery vans, trucks, plant vehicles and increasing visitor vehicles to the two holiday lets and 'glamping' site.

We do not believe that the current properties are served by vehicular access of a safe standard and so would be concerned with any increase in this respect.

3. Residential Amenity: the existing steading consists of 7 properties which sit compactly within the site with an obvious boundary. The addition of a property outwith this grouping will change the character and have a negative impact on the surroundings. The proposed application will also have an impact on the outlook from our property, something that has already been compromised on the North facing aspect since the erection of Ref: 17/00857/FUL.

We understand that we do not have the right to make comment on a particular view but as Scottish Borders Council guidance states that "the relationship between the proposed development and its surroundings should be very carefully considered" we believe it is important to remember that this grouping of properties is located in a rural setting and a new structure outwith the grouping will significantly change the outlook.

4. Infrastructure: again, we note that the proposed dwelling house would encroach on a previously undisturbed green field site where no existing infrastructure exists. We also note that the proposed soak away for waste is also planned to be dug into a previously undisturbed green field where a rural walking route is also located.

5. Appearance: the proposed dwelling house is suburban in design and not suited to the environment where the developer proposes to build it. It would not relate sympathetically to the existing building group. It may be that reference is made to a previous application (Ref: 17/00857/FUL), which was passed, in that the design is similar to this proposal. While we would also argue that this property is also suburban in design and dominates the steading, it is located within the existing grouping and is, therefore, not quite so unsightly.

6. Impact on Natural Environment: while it is true that the proposed dwelling house is planned to be in a setting with no trees or major vegetation around it, it is bordered by mature hedgerows. We are concerned that development of this site and the field adjacent to it will have a negative impact on wildlife, disturbing habitats in the hedgerow and movement patterns of a variety of animals across both fields. Again, we note the proposed development borders, and the soak away drainage will run through, a popular rural walking route, one of the Hawick Paths.

7. Privacy and Health and Wellbeing: As private areas are defined as both rooms within a property and garden areas, we are concerned that our privacy will be compromised by the proposed development. Due to the height, elevation and orientation of the proposed dwelling house we will be aware of the physical presence of the 2-storey structure whether inside or outside. It will also be located at a level higher than our property, giving rise to a feeling of being overlooked and reducing our enjoyment of our own property as we believe there will be an ongoing feeling of intrusiveness.

There is no denying that people live in the country mainly as it enhances their health and wellbeing. It is our opinion that the addition of yet another large structure, outwith the existing

grouping, will significantly reduce our feeling of wellbeing due to the reasons outlined in this objection.

8. Overdevelopment of Site and Substantiation of Proposal: Since moving to our property in 2014 there have been 2 successful applications, leading to the addition of a 4-bedroom and 5-bedroom house, neither of which have, at this time, been sold. We believe that another large, this time 5-bedroom house, is an overdevelopment of a site which currently has the appearance of a tight grouping which is complete. We have been unable to locate any information in the planning application which puts forward a case for the need for yet another dwelling house, something that we understand is important to Scottish Borders Council in applications for proposed houses in the country. We therefore must question the purpose of this application and the need for another large house. Indeed, we are increasingly concerned that if the application is successful this will lead to an increase in the number of holiday lets (currently Ref:15/01380/FUL and part of Ref:17/00857/FUL) in what has been up till now a very quiet rural residential setting.

We do not submit this objection lightly but, as we are very much of the opinion that any additional dwelling house will detract from, and compromise the setting and aspect from our property, have a negative impact on the existing building group, residential wellbeing, privacy and outlook, we feel it is our only recourse.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require any further information.

Yours,

David and Aileen Wilson,  
Owner/Occupiers,  
Westcote Farmhouse,  
Hawick.  
TD9 8SX

**From:** Garry Wight [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 June 2021 08:53  
**To:** Planning & Regulatory Services  
**Subject:** 21/00706/FUL - Objections

**CAUTION:** External Email

### **Application Summary**

Application Number: 21/00706/FUL  
Address: Land South of Stable Cottage (Plot 4) Westcote Farm Hawick Scottish Borders  
Proposal: Erection of dwelling house  
Case Officer: Brett Taylor

### **Customer Details**

Name: Mr & Mrs Garry Wight  
Address: The Bothy, Westcote, Hawick, Scottish Borders TD9 8SX

Dear Sir, I'm writing to object to the above planning permission for the following reasons:

**1. Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours.**

We believe the proposed dwelling would impact on the privacy of the adjacent properties particularly as the height of the building exceeds the height of existing properties. The gardens and windows of the existing houses would be overlooked.

**2. Effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood.**

The current existing properties at Westcote Farm when viewed from afar form a natural circular boundary at the top of the hill. We believe additional properties would change the character and appearance of this natural rural settlement. The proposed dwelling would visually be outside the natural boundary of the existing properties and would be out with the area contained by that sense of place. We would also like to note that the site for the proposed dwelling would break into a previously undeveloped field which would be visually

intrusive in the landscape, and detrimental to landscape characteristics and the scenic quality of the existing dwellings.

**3. Design.**

The house style of the proposed dwelling is not sympathetic to the style of the existing adjacent rural building style farmhouses. Despite the fact that the existing Building Group has a similar house design we would suggest that this building is at least within the natural building group boundary.

4. **Access to the proposed dwelling house.**

The current private access track via junction from the A698 to the property would be heavily impacted due to the additional traffic by additional residents, visitors and service vehicles.

Despite the fact that an attempt was made to improve the surface a number of months ago the track is already starting to deteriorate. Any additional traffic would only make matters worse.

We are concerned that any increase in traffic would make this access completely unsatisfactory. Sadly despite only being in the property a few month we felt we needed to make the above objections having been assured that there were no plans to build on the area of the application.

Please contact us if you require any further information.

Many thanks

Garry and Penny Wight  
The Bothy  
Westcote Farm  
Hawick  
TD9 8SX

**From:**Andrew Limmer  
**Sent:**1 Jul 2021 18:54:13 +0100  
**To:**Planning & Regulatory Services;Taylor, Brett  
**Subject:**21/00706/FUL - Response to Applicant Comments

**CAUTION:** External Email

Dear Mr Taylor

**Application Number:** 21/00706/FUL  
**Proposed Development:** Erection of dwellinghouse  
**Location:** Land South of Stable Cottage (Plot 4), Westcote Farm, Hawick

We are writing in response to the reply lodged by the applicant's agent dated 7<sup>th</sup> June 2021 in relation to our objection to the above application dated 31<sup>st</sup> May 2021. I note that the agent's response is dated 7<sup>th</sup> June 2021 however this only appeared on the Council's planning portal on or around 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021.

**Point 1 □ Use as a Holiday Let**

The applicant has failed to make his intentions clear regarding the use of Plot 4. On the one hand he advises the plot may be retained as some form of inheritance for his children however on the other he mentions the possible sale of the plot.

Whilst the applicant appears willing to agree to a caveated restriction on Plot 4 being operated as a holiday let, we would be extremely concerned that this could be easily navigated by the applicant either:

1. Residing in Plot 4 and subsequently operating Plot 3 as a holiday let; or
2. Transferring ownership of Plot 4 to a connected party and said party operating Plot 4 as a holiday let.

If Plot 3 were to be operated as a holiday let this would have a detrimental impact on our privacy and we would also be concerned about increased noise and light pollution. For example, the garden of Plot 3 is in close proximity to our kitchen and principal bedroom.

Whilst we do not object to the enhancement of tourism and diversification of agriculture in the Scottish Borders we firmly believe this should be done in a sustainable and transparent manner. Local residents who will be directly affected by said developments should be entitled to voice their concerns freely without fear of retribution and intimidation.

**Point 4 □ Access Track**

The applicant states □best efforts□ were made to tar the access track junction with the A698 however we would encourage the Council to challenge this. The applicant cites material



shortages and contractor delays for this non-compliance however during the same period the applicant has managed to advance the construction of Plot 3 to the point of habitation and also carry out significant works at the glamping site.

It is a matter of fact that the applicant has been occupying Plot 3 since 2020 and on review of the Council's Planning Portal we can find no evidence of the applicant informing the Council of the breach of condition no.8 of planning ref 17/00857/FUL.

Furthermore, said condition does not simply require the access track junction to be tarred but also imposes the following additional improvements to the track as noted on approved drawing reference L(-1)102:

- *Loose material on access track to be scraped off and potholes and low spots infilled (the applicant and myself did undertake running repairs to the track during the winter of 2020/21 however this was to repair damage caused by the harsh winter which appeared subsequent to planning ref 17/00857/FUL being approved).*
- *Track to be graded to allow surface water to discharge onto road verges.*
- *Existing passing place no.4 surface to be scraped back to remove vegetation and surface made good.*

Clearly the Council had concerns regarding the access track at the time Plot 3 was consented and the addition of Plot 4, together with the increased vehicular movements associated with the glamping site will only result in further deterioration of the running surface and a reduction in safety.

In his response to other neighbour objections the applicant speculates that any potential occupier of Plot 4 could choose to utilise public transport as their primary means of accessing the plot. I consider this outcome to be highly unlikely given the size of the proposed development is likely to attract family occupiers and the plot's rural location, sited some 600 metres (walking distance) up a steep slope from the junction with the A698. Regardless of this speculation, the addition of Plot 4 would also result in an increased number of service and delivery vehicles using the track

I would also raise safety concerns with more vehicles using the access track junction with the A698 which is steep and suffers from poor visibility, with vehicles often queuing on the A698 (eastbound) to cross the carriageway to turn into Westcote.

I note in the applicant's response to other neighbours' objections that he has claimed to have attempted to formalise a maintenance regime for the access track but has been unable to obtain agreement from the residents. I would refute this claim in the strongest possible terms. Indeed, myself and other neighbours have been pro-active in maintaining the track, manually filling pot-holes, trimming back hedges, etc. The applicant has made no effort to formalise arrangements and has put the residents in a difficult position due to his ownership of the track.

Yours sincerely

Mr Andrew Limmer and Mrs Leonore Limmer  
Owners, The Auld Byre, Westcote Farm, Hawick, TD9 8SX

# Comments for Planning Application 21/00706/FUL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00706/FUL

Address: Land South Of Stable Cottage (Plot 4) Westcote Farm Hawick Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Brett Taylor

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Aileen Wilson

Address: Westcote Farmhouse, Westcote, Hawick, Scottish Borders TD9 8SX

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Mr Taylor,

RE: Email from Agent Fraser Hunter, 7.6.2021

We are writing in response to the points made by the applicant to our objection comments, submitted on 1.6.21, concerning Planning Application Ref:21/00706/FUL.

Point 1: We disagree that the proposed dwelling house will be part of the existing group. As we previously stated in our objection comments it would sit outside the existing grouping, a grouping made even more compact and complete since the erection of Ref:17/00857/FUL.

The applicant states that the proposal lodged 3 years ago (Ref:16/01124/PPP) was not refused but withdrawn; further study shows that the applicant was advised to withdraw the application by Andrew Evans in an email dated 20.10.16 before it was refused:

"It is not possible for Plot 4 to be supported. This is considered not to be well related to the existing building group."

Point 2: We completely disagree with the statement made about the inability for the applicant to formalise any type of agreement for the maintenance of the track due to "the inability of each residential property to agree to this". We have been resident in our property since August 2014 and have at no time been approached to discuss any kind of agreement.

We, like other residents, have helped with the upkeep of the track by filling in potholes, strimming grass verges and trimming back hedges to improve lines of sight. We believe that the applicant has had ample opportunity at these times and others to raise the question of how to formalise an agreement, but this has not happened.

The applicant has submitted this planning application before completion of conditions attached to

the previous application (Ref:17/00857/FUL ) as referenced in Roads Planning drawing Ref:AT2804 L(-1)102, dated 26.7.18. While the challenges presented by the Covid pandemic have been unprecedented we are of the opinion that the applicant had the means to complete aspects of the conditions, such as scraping back the passing place and grading the track to improve water run-off from the track. We also believe that the junction from and to the A698 must be improved as a matter of urgency due to the significant increase in vehicle traffic accessing the glamping site and holiday lets.

We disagree that the potential for 4/5 vehicles is an exaggeration. If, as the applicant seems to indicate, the new dwelling house is sold, it is entirely possible that a family with 2 parents and 2 young adults, all with their own cars, take up residence.

We also believe that, while it might be possible for new residents to access public transport at the junction with the A698, in reality we are of the opinion that this is impractical and will not happen.

Point 3: Our comment in this respect was to place our property in the context of residential amenity and the impact another dwelling would have on our outlook. We would disagree with the statement made by the applicant that "The property on Plot 3 does not overlook any living area or the garden of the old farmhouse." We have chosen to give up the patio area to the front of our house and place privacy blinds on the windows of two of our rooms facing this property, one of which serves as a study which is in daily use. Our concern is that, as we previously stated in our objection comments, our outlook would also be compromised on the South facing aspect by the proposed dwelling house.

Point 4: The applicant has given a few examples in support of new builds; we assume we are correct in our expectation that each application will be taken on its own merits due to differing criteria and circumstances.

Point 5: We stand by our opinion that the proposed dwelling house would not suit the environment for which it is intended.

Point 6: We are glad to hear that the applicant is intending to protect and promote wildlife. We believe it is crucial, however, that while encouraging the growth of wildflowers beside the track, the verges on both sides are clearly defined and not obscured by any planting in order to maintain safe travel, particularly as the track will not only be used by residents, but by holidaymakers not familiar with the gradients and contours of the track.

Point 7: We disagree with the statement "the objector bought the property in 2014 knowing that further farm diversification was imminent". We were aware the applications for two dwelling houses were to be submitted but no more than that.

Point 8: If there is a huge demand for larger, rural properties and people are desperate to relocate to said properties as the applicant states, the property Ref:15/0130/FUL has not then been sold or been made available for long term rent? Again, as we noted in our objection, this raises the

question of substantiating the need for another dwelling house.

In commenting that we seem to contradict ourselves on the matter of privacy and health and well-being our comments were made in respect to the planning application.

The fact remains that we stand by our objection comments. We would also like to stress that while the applicant is seeking this planning application, we believe that the desire to do so must also recognise and respect the fact that there are now a number of privately owned dwelling houses contained within the boundary of the farm who will be directly affected by any developments and diversification, and that these owner/occupiers have the right to share their opinions and concerns without prejudice.

Again, please do not hesitate to contact us if you require any further information.

Yours,

David and Aileen Wilson,  
Owner/Occupiers,  
Westcote Farmhouse,  
Hawick.  
TD9 8SX